UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/876,230	06/08/2001	Vaughn E. Keenan	04694.00073	6194

27160 7590 10/27/2003

PATENT ADMINSTRATOR
KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN
525 WEST MONROE STREET
SUITE 1600
CHICAGO, IL 60661-3693

EXAMINER	
WILSON, JACQUELINE B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2612	13

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/876,230	Applicant(s) Keenan et al.
	Examiner Jacqueline Wilson	Art Unit 2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *three* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Jul 30, 2003* .

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-78* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-20, 23-26, 31-45, 49-52, and 56-78* is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) *21, 22, 27-30, 46-48, and 53-55* is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The declaration filed on 07/30/03 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Vanderwerf et al. (US 6,530,664) reference.

2. Although conception is established, the evidence submitted is insufficient to establish diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the Vanderwerf et al. (US 6,530,664) reference to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice. Referring to MPEP 715.07, the section "Establishment of Dates" indicate that actual dates of acts relied on to establish diligence must be provided (MPEP 715.07(a)). In this case, the applicant did not supply dates in the declaration or Exhibit D indicating establishment of diligence with respect to the claimed invention. Therefore, the examiner maintains the rejections below since evidence of diligence is not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 14-20, 23-26, 31, 33-35, 41-45, 49-52, 56-58, 60-62, 65-69, 74, 75, 77, and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanderwerf et al. (US 6,530,664).

Regarding Claim 1, Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches a generally horizontally extending boom assembly (fig. 13, 708), the boom assembly being positioned above a target area (704), at least one camera (756) mounted on the boom assembly at a location spaced from the plane of the target area, the at least one camera being oriented so that the field of view thereof encompasses the target area (see fig. 13), and a controller (758) in communication with the at least one camera, the controller receiving image data from the at least one camera and processing the image data to form an image of the target area (col. 15, lines 39-53). Although Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches that the camera (756) can be a CMOS or CCD camera, Vanderwerf et al. '664 fails to specifically disclose the at least one camera is a digital camera. Digital camera are notoriously well known in the art and would have been obvious to use a digital camera in this system for use with an electronic screen for providing optimum resolution of the image. Also using digital cameras provide easier processing of the image especially for transmitting images in video and data conferencing (col. 15, lines 55+). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use a digital camera for the purpose of generating quality images.

Regarding Claim 2, Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches the boom assembly is positioned above the midpoint of the target area (see fig 12).

Regarding Claim 3, Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches the boom assembly has a length of from about 30 to 50 inches (referred to as 40 to 60 inches (col. 3, lines 25+).

Regarding Claim 4, Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches the boom assembly is pivotally fixed at a single point of the projection system in which a camera head (756) is located on a distal end of the boom supporting at least one camera (see fig. 13). However, Vanderwerf et al. '664 further teaches that boom assembly may also include an additional hinge or telescopic movement and be coupled to other portions of the frame or to a wall or post (col. 7, lines 20-28).

Regarding Claim 6, Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches the boom assembly may have additional pivoting mechanisms and additional hinges or telescopic movement and also be attached to a wall (col. 7, lines 20-28). One having ordinary skill would recognize the Vanderwerf et al. '664 is disclosing a method of extending and retracting the boom assembly by using these additional mechanisms.

Regarding Claim 7, Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches that a pivot mechanism may be used instead of the pivot point of the projector system. Vanderwerf et al. '664 further teaches that an additional hinge may be incorporated to further allow movement of the boom assembly (col. 7, lines 20-28). This inherently indicates that a pair of hinges are used to fold the boom assembly. One having ordinary skill would recognize that these hinges are inherently spaced at certain locations on the device in which overlapping would occur (referred to as fold over in the claim limitation.

Regarding Claim 8, although Vanderwerf et al. '664 fails to specifically disclose each of the hinges includes a locking mechanism to retain the boom assembly in the extended operating position, it would have been obvious to have a form of lock to maintain the boom assembly in an extended position. Without this form of lock, the boom assembly would not maintain its position and would produce unwanted images. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a locking mechanism to maintain the boom assembly in an extended position for capturing images of the target area.

Regarding Claims 14 and 15, Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches that video conferencing and data conferencing is also capable with this system (col. 15, lines 50+). One having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the use of a computer network would be obvious, if not inherent, for establishing connections with other computer systems for conferencing to various locations which includes observing and analyzing data captured on the electronic screen. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the controller to be coupled to a computer network and uses resources of the computer network for distribution to remote conferencing sites.

Regarding Claim 16, Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches that additional electronic modules to further enhance the system may be placed in the system such as a tuner, network card, sound card, video card, communication devices, etc (col. 15, lines 51+). One having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that an Internet server would have been obvious since connection to

other computer systems for conferencing could be accessed using a server. Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches that additional modules may be used in the system, and therefore, an Internet server would have been an obvious choice for communication purposes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art for the controller to have Internet server capabilities and coupled to a distributed computer network to allow the image to be accessed by a user through an Internet browser.

Regarding Claims 17, 18 and 20 Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches that the functions of the system may be controlled through the control panel, a remote control (not shown), or other control mechanisms (col. 7, lines 18+). One having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that a dedicated appliance/personal computer (which inherently include a display to present the digital image on the monitor) would make an obvious choice for the purpose of operating the system as desired. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use a dedicated appliance or personal computer as an alternate controlling method.

Regarding Claim 19, Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches that image data is sent to a network for video conferencing. One having ordinary skill would recognize that a remote computer system, or the like, would inherently be involved to receive the images. Therefore, a storage location would, at the remote location, also be inherent such that the user at the remote location may save, edit, print, etc, the received information at any desired time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a designated secondary storage location in the distributed computer network.

Claim 23 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claims 1 and 16. (See rejection of Claims 1 and 16 above.)

Regarding Claim 24, Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches the controller automatically publishes the image (see fig. 13, information from the controller 758 distributes the information via LAN, ISDN, etc.).

Claim 25 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 19. (See rejection of Claim 19 above.)

Regarding Claim 26, Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches that the controller distributes the image information to a variety of destination, one being a PCMCIA memory card. It is notoriously well known in the art for a controller to compress image data before storing information onto a memory card. This provides more storage capacity for the PCMCIA card. (Official Notice).

Claim 31 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 4. (See rejection of Claim 4 above.)

Claim 33 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 6. (See rejection of Claim 6 above.)

Claim 34 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 7. (See rejection of Claim 7 above.)

Claim 35 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 8. (See rejection of Claim 8 above.)

Claim 41 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 3. (See rejection of Claim 3 above.)

Regarding Claim 42, Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches a board mounted on a wall (fig. 13, 704), a boom assembly (708), at least one camera (756), and a controller (758; col. 15, lines 39+) having Internet server capabilities (known as video conferencing or data conferencing for publishing image information through a client application). Although Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches that the camera (756) can be a CMOS or CCD camera, Vanderwerf et al. '664 fails to specifically disclose the at least one camera is a digital camera. Digital camera are notoriously well known in the art and would have been obvious to use a digital camera in this system for use with an electronic screen for providing optimum resolution of the image. Also using digital cameras provide easier processing of the image especially for transmitting images in video and data conferencing (col. 15, lines 55+). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use a digital camera for the purpose of generating quality images.

Regarding Claim 43, Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches the target area corresponds to the surface (see fig. 13).

Claim 44 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 19. (See rejection of Claim 19 above.)

Claim 45 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 26. (See rejection of Claim 26 above.)

Claim 49 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 4. (See rejection of Claim 4 above.)

Claim 50 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 3. (See rejection of Claim 3 above.)

Claim 51 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 42. (See rejection of Claim 42 above.)

Claim 52 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 19. (See rejection of Claim 19 above.)

Claim 56 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 42. (See rejection of Claim 42 above.)

Regarding Claim 57, Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches the boom is positioned adjacent the midpoint of the target area (see fig. 13).

Claim 58 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 4. (See rejection of Claim 4 above.)

Claim 60 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 14. (See rejection of Claim 14 above.)

Claim 61 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 16. (See rejection of Claim 16 above.)

Claim 62 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 42. (See rejection of Claim 42 above.)

Regarding Claim 65, Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches a write board mounted on the surface below the arm (referred to as erasable whiteboard (col. 15, lines 46+; see also figures 12 and 13).

Regarding Claim 66, Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches at least on camera (756).

Regarding Claim 67, Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches that the system is controlled by a control panel (114 of fig. 4 which is also shown in fig. 12 unnumbered) or a remote control or other mechanisms (col. 7, lines 18+). As discussed previously, Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches acquiring images and sending them to a variety of destinations, one for the purpose of video conferencing/data conferencing. However, Vanderwerf et al. '664 does not specifically teach the functions of the control panel. One having ordinary skill would readily recognize that the control panel would be obvious if not inherent for operating the device for obtaining images captured by the camera (756; fig. 13) and for purposes such as establishing conferencing connections, storing data, transmitting data, etc. as shown in figure 13. Although it is unclear from the figures as to which buttons performs the specific functions, it would be advantageous to have a specific image capture button for acquiring the image and a second button specifically for video conferencing for sending the images to a site. This provide easy manipulation of the device for new users. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a first button for acquiring an image and a second button to post the acquired image to the site.

Claim 68 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 42. (See rejection of Claim 42 above.)

Claim 69 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 67. (See rejection of Claim 67 above.)

Claim 74 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 42 with the limitation of the controller mounted on the wall surface (see fig. 13, 758 is mounted on the wall surface as well). (See rejection of Claim 42 above.)

Claim 75 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 69. (See rejection of Claim 69 above.)

Claim 77 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 5. (See rejection of Claim 5 above.)

Claim 78 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 67. (See rejection of Claim 67 above.)

5. **Claims 5, 32, 59, and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanderwerf et al. '664 in view of Bates (US 5,490,655).**

Regarding Claim 5, Vanderwerf et al. '664 fails to specifically disclose the wall mount is releasably coupled to a wall plate secured to a wall surface. However, Bates'655 teaches that it is notoriously well known the art mount a video/data projector to a wall mount using a wall plate (fig. 6, 162) secured to a wall surface in which the wall mount is releasably coupled to the wall mount (170; also fig. 7; col. 4, lines 50- col. 5, lines 5). This provides mobility to the apparatus.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Vanderwerf et al. '664 with the teachings of Bates'655 for the purpose of providing a wall mount releasably coupled to a wall plate secured to a wall surface for removing the boom assembly as desired by the user.

Claim 32 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 5. (See rejection of Claim 5 above.)

Claim 59 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 5. (See rejection of Claim 5 above.)

Claim 64 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 5. (See rejection of Claim 5 above.)

6. **Claims 9-13, and 36-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanderwerf et al. '664 in view of Saund (US 5,528,290).**

Regarding Claim 9, although Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches that additional cameras may be directed to the target area (col. 15, lines 45-48), Vanderwerf et al. '664 fails to disclose each of the cameras has a field of view that encompasses a distinct section of the target area, the fields of view of adjacent cameras overlapping slightly. However, Saund'290 teaches a camera subsystem (54) which captures a target area may also use a plurality of cameras each directed at a different subregions of the target area (col. 3, lines 25+). The subregions, referred to as image tiles, generally overlap one another (as shown in figure 3) for the intention of producing a

complete image. It would have been obvious to use a plurality of cameras for the purpose of capturing an entire target area which would result in a complete image. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have a plurality of cameras each having a field of view that encompasses a distinct section of the target area, the fields of view of adjacent cameras overlapping slightly.

Regarding Claims 10 and 11, Vanderwerf et al. '664 and Saund'290 both teaches using a plurality a cameras. It would have been a matter of design choice as desired at the time of manufacturing to use either two, three, or more cameras. Since Vanderwerf et al. '664 and Saund'290 teaches the plurality of cameras, one having ordinary skill would recognize that this includes more than one camera. This enables capturing of an entire target area. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use two or three cameras in the system of Vanderwerf et al. '664 and Saund'290.

Regarding Claim 12, Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches a single camera (see fig. 13; 756).

Regarding Claim 13, Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches that the camera (756) is pivotally mounted to capture documents presented on the target area or to capture the presenter (col. 15, lines 44+). However, Vanderwerf et al. '664 fails to specifically disclose the images of adjacent distinct sections of the target overlap. However, Saund'290 teaches the distinct sections of the target area, referred to as image tiles, generally overlap one another (as shown in figure 3) for the intention of producing a complete image. It would have been obvious that the sections of the target overlaps each other so an entire image is captured without any "missing" spaces (col. 3,

lines 44+). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the distinct sections of the target area to overlap as taught by Saund'290.

Claim 36 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 9. (See rejection of Claim 9 above.)

Claim 37 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 10. (See rejection of Claim 10 above.)

Claim 38 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 11. (See rejection of Claim 11 above.)

Claim 39 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 12. (See rejection of Claim 12 above.)

Claim 40 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 13. (See rejection of Claim 13 above.)

7. **Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanderwerf et al. '664 in view of Funado (US 5,537,107).**

Regarding Claim 20, Vanderwerf et al. '664 fails to specifically disclose the controller includes a display to present the digital image. However, Funado'107 teaches a remote controller (U) which includes a display (2) for displaying images. Funado'107 teaches that having a remote controller with a display is advantageous for displaying the image data and control information and therefore making the remote controller unit multi-functional (col. 1, lines 55- col. 2, line 12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide Vanderwerf et al. '664 with a controller that includes a display to present the digital images, as taught by Funado'107.

8. **Claims 63, 70-73, and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanderwerf et al. '664 in view of Saund (US 6,517,266).**

Regarding Claim 63, Vanderwerf et al. '664 fails to specifically disclose the controller includes a web server having a dedicated web address. However, in order to transmit data to a web site, it would have essential to have a web address for locating information. Saund'266 teaches sending data to various kinds of destinations such as a LAN, WAN, the Internet, the World Wide Web, etc (col. 4, lines 58+). In order to access information using any of these distributed networks, one having ordinary skill would recognize that a web address is needed to locate the information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have a web address in the system of Vanderwerf et al. '664 for the purpose of accessing information transmitting from the system.

Claim 70 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 63. (See rejection of Claim 63 above.)

Claim 71 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 5. (See rejection of Claim 5 above.)

Claim 72 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 67. (See rejection of Claim 67 above.)

Regarding Claim 73, Vanderwerf et al. '664 teaches the controller is mounted to one side of the writing surface (shown on the bottom side of surface; see fig. 12).

Claim 76 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 63. (See rejection of Claim 63 above.)

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 21-22, 27-30, 46-48, and 53-55 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding Claim 21, the prior art neither teaches nor fairly suggest a system for capturing images of a target area comprising a generally horizontally extending boom assembly, at least one digital camera mounted on the boom assembly, and a controller in communication with the at least one digital camera, as claimed in claim 1, wherein the controller has Internet server capabilities and is coupled to a distributed computer network to allow the digital image to be accessed by a user through an Internet browser, and wherein **the controller processes image data received from the at least one digital camera to yield high contrast pen strokes on a white or empty background.**

Regarding Claim 27, the prior art neither teaches nor fairly suggests a system for capturing images of a target area comprising a boom assembly, at least one digital camera mounted on the boom assembly, and a controller in communication with the at least one digital camera, as claimed in claim 23, wherein the controller automatically publishes the digital image and processes the image data received from the at least one digital camera to reduce the size of the digital image, and wherein **image data is processed to yield high contrast pen strokes on a white or empty background.**

Regarding Claim 46, the prior art neither teaches nor fairly suggests capturing images of a target surface comprising a board mounted on a wall, a boom assembly, at least one digital camera mounted on the boom assembly, and a controller in communication with the at least one digital camera and having Internet server capabilities, as claimed in Claim 42, wherein the target area corresponds to the surface, the controller also sends the electronic image to a designated secondary storage location and processes image data received from the at least one digital camera to reduce the size of the digital image, and wherein **the image data is processed to yield high contrast pen strokes on a white or empty background.**

Regarding Claim 53, the prior art neither teaches nor fairly suggests acquiring an image of a target area that includes information recorded on the target area using an optical recording device, the optical recording device being mounted on a generally horizontal boom positioned above the target area, posting the image to a site in response to user input to allow the image to

be accessed by a user through a client browser application, and **processing the image to yield high contrast pen strokes on a white or empty background prior to the posting.**

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Byrd et al. (US 6,633,328) - teaches horizontally extending boom assembly positioned above a target area, digital camera, and controller (fig. 1)

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiries concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to **Jacqueline Wilson** whose telephone number is (703) 308-5080. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday (alternate Fridays off) from 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Wendy Garber**, can be reached at (703) 305-4929. The fax number for this group is (703) 872-9314.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or Faxed to:

(703) 872-9314, (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, V.A., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

JBW

October 16, 2003

NGOC-YEN VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER